



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/799,683

03/15/2004

Mikimasa Honma

02860.0780

8657

22852 7590 05/13/2010
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, MYLES D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/13/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/799,683	Applicant(s) HONMA, MIKIMASA	
	Examiner Myles D. Robinson	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6 - 9, 11 and 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6 - 9, 11 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 June 2009 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/6/2010 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment was received on 2/12/2010, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 1, 6 – 9, 11 and 12** are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments (*see Remarks 2/12/2010*) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding **claims 1, 9 and 11**, the Applicant argues that **Goodman et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 7,020,697) in view of **MacKay** (U.S. Patent No. 5,718,520) lacks a prima facie case of obviousness because Goodman is alleged to be non-analogous prior art. Specifically, the Applicant argues that Goodman is directed to a completely different field of endeavor (e.g. PC or workstation with a graphical user interface running a web browser), a field that is unrelated to the claimed invention of "an image forming

Art Unit: 2625

apparatus connected to a network," and lists examples of image forming apparatuses (e.g. copying machine, printer, fax machine, scanner, etc.) (see *Remarks 2/12/2010 [pages 8 – 9]*).

In response to Applicant's argument that Goodman is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of Applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the Applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Goodman and MacKay are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being networked printing systems (see *Goodman wherein Figs. 5 – 6 wherein presentation service 62 comprises report and print service 138 for creation and preview of documents, which contain graphics or image data for printing, by users whom can specify output conditions [column 73, line 53 – column 74, line 12] and see Figs. 5 and 8 wherein communication services 66 comprises printing services 226 [column 82, lines 6 – 9 and column 93, lines 32 – 47]*).

Claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification as well as with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. See MPEP 2111. Although the Applicant argues that "an image forming apparatus connected to a network" could possibly be, for example, a copying machine or a printer, the scope of the claims do not explicitly limit one of ordinary skill in the art to any particular one of those examples listed. The Examiner contends that, under the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification as well as with the

Art Unit: 2625

interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach, a computer with a monitor to display images (e.g. PC or workstation with a graphical user interface running a web browser) and capable of performing printing services could very well be added to the list of examples of "image forming apparatuses."

Though understanding the claim language may be aided by explanations contained in the written description, it is important not to import into a claim limitations that are not part of the claim. For example, a particular embodiment appearing in the written description (i.e. the Applicant attempts to import the particular embodiments of a copying machine, printer, etc. into the claim limitation "image forming apparatus") may not be read into a claim when the claim language is broader than the embodiment. The Examiner contends that the broad claim language "image forming apparatus" also encompasses computing systems (e.g. PCs, workstations, etc.) as well as the Applicant's listed examples. See MPEP 2111.01.

Therefore, the Examiner is not persuaded by the Applicant's arguments because

- 1) Goodman discloses structure capable of displaying images via a graphical user interface and web browser and capable of performing printing services, which are all substantially equivalent to the structure and normal operation of the claimed "image forming apparatus", and
- 2) the Applicant improperly imports claim limitations from the specification when the present claim language is broad enough to include the particular embodiments listed by Applicant's remarks as well as other embodiments as disclosed by Goodman.

Art Unit: 2625

4. Regarding **claims 1, 9 and 11**, the Applicant argues that Goodman in view of MacKay does not disclose, teach or suggest a storage section comprising first and second job ticket storing areas within the same apparatus (*see Remarks 2/12/2010 [pages 10 – 11]*).

However, MacKay does disclose a storage section comprising first and second job ticket storing areas within the same apparatus. MacKay teaches that the job file 155 is a single memory in a printing system for storing multiple print jobs 156 with their corresponding job tickets 150 in step 208 (*see Figs. 7 and 11 [Abstract, column 2, lines 30 – 37, column 6, lines 30 – 34 and column 8, lines 33 – 36]*). Each of area within job file 155 storing print job 156 with its accompanying job ticket 150 (e.g. JOB 1, JOB 2,... JOB N) is equivalent to a job ticket storing area. For example, the first job ticket storing area within job file 155 stores JOB 1, the second job ticket storing area within the same job file 155 stores JOB 2, and so forth. MacKay discloses that their concept of a single storage section comprising plural job ticket storing areas is analogous to a conventional searchable database wherein each job ticket can be stored and edited within the job file (*see Figs. 11 – 13, steps 204, 206, 208 [column 8, lines 14 – 17 and 29 – 36]*). One of ordinary skill in the art interprets a conventional database taught by MacKay as an integrated collection (i.e. single storage section) arranged for interrelating individual records or files (i.e. job ticket storing areas) during archiving and searching.

Furthermore, MacKay teaches that a first job ticket storing area is configured for local edition (via the operation section) (*see Figs. 2 and 6 wherein UI 52 allows the user to program Job Ticket 150 [column 3, lines 6 – 9, column 5, lines 19 – 31 and column 6,*

Art Unit: 2625

lines 8 – 23], see Figs. 1 – 2 wherein image input section 4 has on-site image input [column 3, lines 44 – 51] and see Fig. 11 wherein print jobs are edited steps 200 – 210 [column 8, lines 14 – 17 and 37 – 45]) and teaches a second job ticket storing area is configured for remote edition (via the remote operation apparatus) (see Fig. 10 wherein various apparatuses are associated with I/O apparatuses 176, print services 178, scan service 180 and FAX services 182 via network interface 172 [column 3, lines 44 – 51, column 6, lines 23 – 29, 55 – 64, column 7, line 21 – column 8, line 13], see Figs. 1 – 2 wherein image input section 4 has remote image input which enables system 2 to provide a network printing system with remote input [column 3, lines 44 – 51] and see Fig. 11 wherein print jobs are edited steps 200 – 210 [column 8, lines 14 – 17 and 37 – 45]). It has been held that the recitation that an element is "adapted to/for," "capable of/to/for," "sufficient of/to/for," "configured to/for," or "for" doing something, that is with the exception of clearly invoking 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph, is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. See MPEP 2114. The prior art set forth above is capable of performing for such intended use. For instance, according to MacKay, the first job ticket storing area (e.g. JOB 1 of job file 155 shown in Fig. 7) is capable of local edition via UI 52 and the second job ticket storing area (e.g. JOB 2 of job file 155) is capable of remote access and edition via I/O apparatuses connected via the network arrangement 170 and interface 176.

Moreover, Goodman does disclose a storage section comprising first and second job storing areas within the same apparatus. Although the Examiner's former interpretation of the teachings of Goodman, in which the local storage and another storage remote storage are two distinctly separate storage areas, is incongruent with the present claim language, the Examiner's revised interpretation of the same prior art reference remains substantially applicable and capable of meeting the claims. Goodman teaches that each client 78, 79, 120 (e.g. an image forming apparatus, as discussed above) includes information services 64 (see *Fig. 5*) and that the information services 64 manage information and enable applications to access and manipulate data stored locally or remotely from documents or databases. Also, information services 64 are capable of storing data on a single physical platform using database services 160 (see *Fig. 7 [column 76, lines 49 – 65]*). Similar to the rationale discussed above regarding MacKay, one of ordinary skill in the art interprets a conventional database taught by Goodman as an integrated collection (i.e. single storage section) arranged for interrelating individual records or files (i.e. job storing areas) during archiving and searching.

5. Regarding **claims 1, 9 and 11**, the Applicant argues that Goodman in view of MacKay does not disclose, teach or suggest the job ticket, which is stored within the second job ticket storing area, is capable of being edited only by the remote operation apparatus (see *Remarks 2/12/2010 [pages 10 – 11]*).

However, Goodman does disclose the job, which is stored within the second job storing area, is capable of being edited only by the remote operation apparatus.

Goodman teaches that one of clients 78, 79, 120 (e.g. an image forming apparatus, as discussed above) as well as any one of the remaining clients 78, 79, 120 (e.g. remote operation apparatus connected to the image forming apparatus via a network) includes presentation services 62 and information services 64, which, in conjunction with one another, are capable of storage and edition of print job data (see *Fig. 5*).

Specifically, Goodman discloses that the information services 64, which include document access services 170 for creating, maintaining and retrieving documents (see *Fig. 7 [column 78, lines 3 – 5 and column 81, lines 21 – 29]*), manage information and enable applications to access and manipulate (i.e. edit) data stored locally or remotely from documents or databases (see *Figs. 5 and 7 [column 76, lines 49 – 65]*). One of ordinary skill in the art interprets a conventional database taught by Goodman as an integrated collection (i.e. single storage section) arranged for interrelating individual records or files (i.e. job storing areas) during archiving and searching. Moreover, Goodman discloses that the print services 138 of presentation services 62 allow the user to edit print data and to consider varying print scenarios using a conventional user interface, such as a web browser (see *Fig. 6 [column 2, lines 45 – 55, column 72, lines 26 – 33, column 73, lines 53 – 61 and column 74, lines 24 – 39]*). Therefore, Goodman discloses structures under normal operation which are capable of storing and remotely editing a job.

The Applicant argues that Goodman does not disclose a remote operation apparatus having the capability of exclusively editing stored print job data. However, it has been held that the recitation that an element is "adapted to/for," "capable of/to/for," "sufficient of/to/for," "configured to/for," or "for" doing something, that is with the exception of clearly invoking 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph, is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. See MPEP 2114. The prior art set forth below is capable of performing for such intended use.

However, Goodman discloses database security services 168 that enforce access control to ensure records (i.e. the plural job storing areas within the storage section) are only editable by authorized people for approved purposes. Also, document security services 168 allow for exclusive access via document management backbone, which determines how documents are accessed and who may access documents (see *Fig. 7 [column 77, lines 25 – 34 and column 81, lines 5 – 9]*). In conjunction with security services 168, document access services 170 limits concurrent editing using check-in/check-out services, which are analogous to record locking to prevent two users from editing the same data (see *Fig. 7 wherein security services 168 performs concurrency control by record locking [column 77, lines 25 – 33 and column 81, lines 10 – 30] in such a manner that priority is given to whichever user, whether local or remote, whom already has access to the document [i.e. first-come-first-serve] such that*

Art Unit: 2625

whichever user comes thereafter, no matter whether local or remote, is locked out). In other words, the check-in/check-out services (i.e. concurrency control) of Fig. 6 are capable of preventing edition by the image forming apparatus while only allowing edition by the remote operation apparatus for the purpose of preventing two users from editing the same data at the same time.

Therefore, the Applicant's arguments regarding claims 1, 9 and 11 are considered not persuasive. Please cite rationale of the grounds of rejection below for further explanation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. ***Claims 1, 6 – 9, 11 and 12*** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Goodman *et al.*** (U.S. Patent No. 7,020,697) in view of **MacKay** (U.S. Patent No. 5,718,520).

Furthermore, it has been held that the recitation that an element is "adapted to/for," "capable of/to/for," "sufficient of/to/for," "configured to/for," or "for" doing something, that is with the exception of clearly invoking 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph, is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim.

Art Unit: 2625

See MPEP 2114. The prior art set forth below is capable of performing for such intended use.

Referring to **claim 1**, Goodman discloses an image forming apparatus connected to a network, comprising:

an operation section (*see Figs. 4 – 5 wherein web browsers on clients 78, 79, 120 offer users a graphical interface [column 2, lines 45 – 55, column 70, lines 33 – 40 and 57 – 62]*) for editing a job specifying an output condition to output image data onto an output medium (*see Figs. 5 – 6 wherein presentation service 62 comprises report and print service 138 for creation and preview of documents, which contain graphics or image data for printing, by users whom can specify output conditions [column 73, line 53 – column 74, line 12] and see Figs. 5 and 8 wherein communication services 66 comprises printing services 226 [column 82, lines 6 – 9 and column 93, lines 32 – 47]*),

an interface section to communicate a remote operation apparatus through the network (*see Figs. 4 – 5 wherein clients 78, 79, 120 are interconnected in netcentric computing system 10 such that client 78 is equivalent to an image forming apparatus and any one of the second clients 79, 120 are equivalent to a remote apparatus [column 70, lines 33 – 40, 57 – 62 and column 72, lines 14 – 21]*),

a storage section having a first job storing area which is configured to store the job capable of being edited by the operation section, and a second job storing area which is configured to store the job capable of being edited only by the remote operation apparatus (*see Figs. 5 and 7 wherein information services 64 manage information and enable applications to access and manipulate data stored from documents or databases*

Art Unit: 2625

[i.e. a conventional database is an integrated collection (i.e. single storage section) arranged for interrelating individual records or files (i.e. job storing areas) during archiving and searching] such that services 64 is capable of storing data on a single physical platform using database services 160 [column 76, lines 49 – 65], see Fig. 7 wherein document security systems 168 only allows documents to be accessed exclusively through the document management backbone in such a way that document management access control services include check-in/check-out services to limit concurrent editing, which is analogous to the functionality of record locking [i.e. preventing two users from editing the same data (concurrency control)] [column 77, lines 25 – 34 and column 81, lines 5 – 20]), and

a control section (see Figs. 5 and 7, information services 64 [column 76, lines 49 – 58]) configured to:

control the image forming apparatus, when a request for editing a job is received from the remote operation apparatus (see Figs. 4 – 6 wherein presentation services 62 utilize web browsers on clients 78, 79, 120 which offer users a graphical user interface [column 2, lines 45 – 55, column 70, lines 33 – 40, 57 – 62 and column 72, lines 26 – 33] and wherein presentation services 62 also includes print services 138 for the creation and previewing of print jobs [column 73, lines 53 – 61] and see Fig. 7 wherein document access services 170 supports document creation, maintenance and retrieval [column 78, lines 3 – 5 and column 81, lines 21 – 29]), in such a way as to read out the job from the one job storing area, and write the read job into the another job storing area (see

Art Unit: 2625

Figs. 5 and 7 wherein information services 64 manage information and enable applications to access and manipulate data stored from documents or databases such that services 64 is capable of storing data on a single physical platform using database services 160 [column 76, lines 49 – 65] and see Fig. 8 wherein communication services 66 enables applications to interact with other local applications on the same workstation [column 82, lines 6 – 9 and column 83, lines 4 – 17]) for allowing the remote operation apparatus to edit the job ticket (see Fig. 7, document access services 170 [column 78, lines 3 – 5 and column 81, lines 21 – 29]), and

control the image forming apparatus, when a request for saving a job is received from the remote operation apparatus (see Figs. 4 – 6 wherein presentation services 62 utilize web browsers on clients 78, 79, 120 which offer users a graphical user interface [column 2, lines 45 – 55, column 70, lines 33 – 40, 57 – 62 and column 72, lines 26 – 33] and wherein presentation services 62 also includes print services 138 for the creation and previewing of print jobs [column 73, lines 53 – 61] and see Fig. 7 wherein document access services 170 supports document creation, maintenance and retrieval [column 78, lines 3 – 5 and column 81, lines 21 – 29]), in such a way as to read the job edited by the remote operation apparatus from the another job storing area, and write the read job edited by the remote operation apparatus into the one job storing area (see Figs. 5 and 7 wherein information services 64 manage information and enable applications to access and manipulate data stored from documents or databases

such that services 64 is capable of storing data on a single physical platform using database services 160 [column 76, lines 49 – 65] and see Fig. 8 wherein communication services 66 enables applications to interact with other local applications on the same workstation [column 82, lines 6 – 9 and column 83, lines 4 – 17]).

However, Goodman does not explicitly disclose the apparatus further comprising the operation section for editing of a job ticket, which is associated with the job, which specifies the output condition to output image onto the output medium.

Mackay discloses the apparatus comprising:

an operation section (see Figs. 2 and 6 wherein UI 52 allows the user to program Job Ticket 150 [column 3, lines 6 – 9, column 5, lines 19 – 31 and column 6, lines 8 – 23]) for editing of a job ticket associated with the job (see Figs. 7 – 9 wherein the user interfaces with arrangements of multiple different jobs 156 [e.g. JOB 1, JOB 2,... JOB N] as organized within job file 155 and print queue 165 via touchscreen 62 [column 6, lines 30 – 54] and see Figs. 11 – 13 wherein multiple different jobs 156 are user-created and user-edited [column 8, lines 13 – 21 and 37 – 45]) specifying an output condition (see Fig. 6 wherein job characteristics and attributes are the equivalent of specified output image data conditions [column 8, lines 21 – 27]) to output image data onto an output medium (see Fig. 2, paper supply 107 [column 4, lines 45 – 54]),

an interface section (see Fig. 2, processor 25c [column 4, lines 25 - 26] and see Fig. 10, network interface 172 [column 6, lines 55 – 64]) to communicate with a remote operation apparatus (see Fig. 10 wherein various apparatuses are associated with I/O

Art Unit: 2625

apparatuses 176, print services 178, scan service 180 and FAX services 182 [column 3, lines 44 – 51, column 6, lines 23 – 29, column 7, line 21 – column 8, line 13]) through the network (see Fig. 2, network 5 [column 3, line 61 – column 4, line 3] and see Fig. 10, net 174),

a storage section having a first job ticket storing area which is configured to store the job ticket capable of being edited by the operation section, and a second job ticket storing area which is configured to store the job ticket capable of being edited by the remote operation apparatus (see Figs. 7 and 11 wherein job ticket 150 are stored job file 155 in steps 202 – 208 [Abstract, column 6, lines 34 – 45 and column 8, lines 29 – 36], see Figs. 1 – 2 wherein image input section 4 has both remote and on-site image inputs which enables system 2 to provide a network printing system with remote input [column 3, lines 44 – 51] and see Fig. 11 wherein print jobs are edited steps 200 – 210 [column 8, lines 14 – 17 and 37 – 45]), and

a control section (see Fig. 2, system control 54, printer system control 128 [column 4, line 62 – column 5, line 11]) configured to:

allow editing of the job ticket stored in the first and second job ticket storing areas (see Figs. 7 – 9 wherein multiple different jobs 156 are arranged within job file 155 and print queue 165 [column 6, lines 30 – 54] and see Figs. 11 – 13 wherein multiple different jobs 156 are user-created and user-edited in steps 200 – 210 [column 8, lines 13 – 21 and 37 – 45]).

Goodman and MacKay are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being networked printing systems. At the time of the invention, it would have

Art Unit: 2625

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include edition of one or more different print job tickets along with networked printing systems. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to quickly and conveniently fix erroneous print attributes in job tickets, as suggested by MacKay (*column 2, lines 15 – 29 and column 10, lines 7 – 49*).

Referring to **claim 6**, MacKay disclose the apparatus further wherein the interface section is connected with a plurality of remote operation apparatus (*see Fig. 10 wherein various apparatuses are associated with I/O apparatuses 176, print services 178, scan service 180 and FAX services 182 [column 3, lines 44 – 51, column 6, lines 23 – 29, column 7, line 21 – column 8, line 13]*), and the second job ticket storing area (*see Fig. 2, main memory 56 [column 5, lines 32 – 46] and see Fig. 7, job file 144, printer queue 164*) comprises:

a plurality of job ticket storing areas for storing the job ticket (*see Fig. 7 wherein each different print jobs 156 [e.g. JOB 1, JOB 2,... JOB N] stored within either job file 144 or printer queue 164 is associated with a job ticket 150 [column 3, lines 6 – 9, column 6, lines 8 – 22] and see Fig. 11, steps 200 – 208 [column 8, lines 29 – 42]*) capable of being edited by the plurality of remote operation apparatus (*see Figs. 1 – 2 wherein image input section 4 has both remote and on-site image inputs which enables system 2 to provide a network printing system with remote input [column 3, lines 44 – 51] and see Fig. 11 wherein print jobs are edited steps 200 – 210 [column 8, lines 14 – 17 and 37 – 45]*),

wherein the control section is configured to control the image forming apparatus to, when the control section receives the request for editing the job ticket, the job ticket being subjected to the edition into one of the plurality of job ticket storing areas from one of the plurality of remote operation apparatus (*see Figs. 1 – 2 wherein image input section 4 has both remote and on-site image inputs which enables system 2 to provide a network printing system with remote input [column 3, lines 44 – 51] and see Fig. 11 wherein print jobs are edited steps 200 – 212 [column 8, lines 14 – 21 and 37 – 45]*) but does not explicitly disclose the apparatus further wherein the control section is configured to write, to make it possible for the remote operation apparatus to exclusively edit the job ticket.

Goodman discloses the apparatus wherein the jobs are capable of being edited by a remote operation apparatus (*see Figs. 4 – 5 wherein web browsers on clients 78, 79, 120 offer users a graphical interface [column 2, lines 45 – 55, column 70, lines 33 – 40 and 57 – 62], see Figs. 5 – 6, presentation services 62 [column 72, lines 26 – 33] and see Fig. 7, document access services 170 [column 78, lines 3 – 5 and column 81, lines 21 – 29]*),

wherein the control section (*see Figs. 5 and 7, information services 64 [column 76, lines 49 – 58]*) is configured to write, to make it possible for the remote operation apparatus to exclusively edit the job (*see Fig. 7 wherein security services 168 performs concurrency control [column 77, lines 25 – 33 and column 81, lines 10 – 17]*).

Referring to **claim 7**, Goodman discloses the apparatus further wherein when the control section receives the request for editing the job ticket (*see Fig. 7, document*

Art Unit: 2625

access services 170 [column 78, lines 3 – 5 and column 81, lines 21 – 29]) from said one of the plurality of remote operation apparatus (see Figs. 4 – 5 wherein clients 78, 79, 120 are interconnected in netcentric computing system 10 such that client 78 is equivalent to an image forming apparatus and any one of the second clients 79, 120 is equivalent to a remote apparatus [column 70, lines 33 – 40, 57 – 62 and column 72, lines 14 – 21]), the control section transmits identification information to identify the job ticket being subjected to the editing to said one of the plurality of the remote operation apparatus (see Fig. 7 wherein document access services 170 supports document retrieval such that identification information uniquely associated with each document is necessary in order to properly implement document retrieval, and therefore, identification information associated with each job ticket is inherently disclosed).

Referring to **claim 8**, Goodman discloses the apparatus further wherein in a case where each of the plurality of job ticket storing areas is filled with the job ticket when the control section receives the request for editing the job ticket from said one of the plurality of remote operation apparatus (see Fig. 7 wherein security service 168 performs concurrency control by record locking [column 77, lines 25 – 33 and column 81, lines 10 – 17] in such a manner that priority is given to whichever user, whether local or remote, already has access to the document [i.e. first-come-first-serve] such that whichever user comes thereafter, no matter whether local or remote, is locked out), the control section notifies said one of the plurality of the remote operation apparatus that the request editing of the job ticket is impossible (see Fig. 38 wherein monitoring component 832 notifies users of clients 78, 79, 120, whether by one-way or two-way

Art Unit: 2625

communications, of events and faults within the system [column 121, line 16 – column 122, line 7 and column 123, lines 25 – 35 and 46 – 53]).

Also, MacKay discloses fault message notification when editing job tickets (see *Figs. 7 – 9 and 15 [column 10, lines 37 – 40]*).

Referring to **claim 9**, the rationale provided in the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein. In addition, the apparatus of claim 1 performs the method of claim 9.

Referring to **claims 11 and 12**, the rationale provided in the rejections of claims 6 and 7, respectively, are incorporated herein. In addition, the apparatuses of claims 6 and 7 perform the methods of claims 11 and 12, respectively.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Foster et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,207,069), **Volkoff et al.** (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0184240), **Oakeson et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 7,349,869) and **Simpson et al.** (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0194245) disclose branch locking of job tickets to control concurrency (*see Abstract and Figs. 2, 4 and 6 – 14*).

Bowman-Amuah (U.S. Patent Nos. 6,640,238, 7,289,964, 6,842,906, 6,742,015, 6,715,145, 6,640,249, 6,640,244, 6,636,242, 6,615,253, 6,615,199, 6,606,660, 6,601,234, 6,601,192, 6,578,068, 6,571,282, 6,550,057, 6,549,949, 6,539,396, 6,529,948, 6,529,909, 6,502,213, 6,496,850, 6,477,665, 6,477,580, 6,442,748,

Art Unit: 2625

6,438,594, 6,434,628, 6,434,568, 6,339,832, 6,332,163 and 6,289,382) discloses a system for a globally addressable interface in a communication services patterns environment wherein documents are accessed exclusively through a document management backbone which, similar to record locking to prevent two users from editing the same data, include check-in/check-out services to limit concurrent editing of documents (*see Abstracts*).

Walker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,249,314) disclose a simultaneous multi-user document editing system (*see Abstract and Fig. 1*).

Haga (U.S. Patent No. 7,536,128), which is the patent of the previously cited Patent Publication Application No. 2005/0146751, discloses an image forming apparatus for forming an image based upon a job ticket, a remote operation apparatus for remotely operating the image forming apparatus via a network and a controller for editing the job ticket according to a remote request (*see Abstract and Figs. 1 – 8*).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Myles D. Robinson whose telephone number is (571)272-5944. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler L. Haskins can be reached on (571) 272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Myles D. Robinson/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625
5/7/10

/Twyler L. Haskins/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625